

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time on December 11, 2007 to discuss the present case, including the Office Communication dated December 5, 2007 and the Office Action dated August 8, 2007.

As discussed during the telephone conference with the Examiner on December 11, Applicants amended the claims of the corresponding international application PCT/KR2004/000640 under PCT Article 34 during Chapter II Examination. Also, as discussed, it is these amended claims that should have been examined, not the claims originally presented at the time the PCT application was filed. It should be noted that the Applicants, on September 23, 2005, filed the present application with a copy of Form PCT/IPEA/409 and its annexes, which included a listing of the amended claims, a copy of which is attached hereto (i.e., the claims that should have been examined). According to M.P.E.P. §1893.01(a)(3), the amendments “will normally be entered into the U.S. national stage application by the Office absent a clear instruction by the applicant that annexes are not to be entered.” Applicants provided no such instruction and, in fact, Applicants intended to have the amended claims entered and examined.

It would appear from the Notice of Acceptance, dated January 19, 2007, that the Patent Office accepted Applicants’ filing including the Form PCT/IPEA/409 and all its annexes, including the amended claims. However, as stated, the original claims were inadvertently examined, not the amended claims. The Examiner agreed, during the December 11, 2007 teleconference, to examine the amended claims, and any additional amendments thereto, if Applicants provide a listing of these claims in the present response. Accordingly, the listing of claims that begins on page 2 of this response reflects the followings:

1) the claims as amended during Chapter II Examination with a few additional amendments to make the claims read more clearly; and

2) Applicants' response to Restriction on May 14, 2007.

In view of Applicants' remark above, claim 1 is hereby amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-17 are currently pending, of which claims 4-17 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 1 for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3 now more clearly define the subject matter. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0093077 to Jung et al. (hereafter "*Jung*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0048978 to Okada et al. (hereafter "*Okada*") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0048004 to Hosaka et al. (hereafter "*Hosaka*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *Jung*, *Okada*, and *Hosaka*, either singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of claims 1-3, and thus, cannot render these claims obvious.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, that “Y is a di-valent organic group derived from aliphatic, alicyclic, or non-conjugated aromatic diamines which have 3-30 carbon atoms and side chains, wherein the side chains have one or more ethylenically unsaturated bonds that may be crosslinked by a radical.” *Jung* fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 1. While, *Jung* discloses “Y is divalent” and “derived from diamine represented by the following Formula 5: $\text{H}_2\text{N}-\text{Y}-\text{NH}_2$,” none of the compounds covered by Formula 5 has one or more ethylenically unsaturated bonds. See *Jung*, paragraphs 0047, 0048. *Okada* and *Hosaka* do not cure this deficiency. *Okada* was cited for teaching the molecular weight of the polyimide precursor, and *Hosaka* was cited for teaching alicyclic tetracarboxylic acid. *Office Action*, page 4, lines 7-12.

Furthermore, claim 1 is expressly directed to a “reactive transparent polyimide precursor having the structure in the following Chemical Formula 1.” *Jung* teaches away from the claimed precursor. The presence of the ethylenically unsaturated bonds, as claimed, enables the claimed precursor to form a negative-type photosensitive resin composition. See, for example, *Specification*, page 16, lines 19-15, and page 19, lines 14-17. Instead, *Jung* teaches precursors for positive-type photosensitive polyimides. *Jung* further states that “photosensitive polyimides are preferred over negative-type photosensitive polyimides, because positive-type photosensitive polyimides exhibit superior resolution.” *Jung*, paragraph 0011. One of ordinary skill in the art would, therefore, not rely on *Jung* to arrive at the claimed precursor.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the combined teaching of *Jung*, *Okada*, and *Hosaka*. Claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same


reasons as claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No. 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

Attachment